Appl. No. 10/020,310
Amdt. dated: _____August 15, 2006
Reply to Office Action of May 17, 2006

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Prior to this Amendment claims 9-17, 20, 21 and 25-27 were pending in the application. Claims 9, 15, 16, and 20 have been amended, claim 14 has been canceled and claims 28-34 have been added. Therefore, claims 9-13, 15-17, 20, 21, and 25-34 are now present for examination. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of these claims for at least the reasons presented below.

Claim Amendments

Claims 9, 15, 16, and 20 have been amended, and claims 28-34 have been added by this amendment. Claim 9 was amended to include allowable subject matter from now canceled claim 14, as suggested by the Examiner. Office Action, p. 2, ¶ 2. Claim 15 was rewritten in independent form, incorporating limitations from base claim 9, as suggested by the Examiner. Office Action, p. 2, ¶ 2. Support for the amendments to Claims 16 and 20, and new claims 28-31 can be found throughout the Specification, for example, at ¶¶ 17-18. Support for new Claims 32-34 can be found throughout the Specification, for example, at ¶¶ 25-28. Claims 9, 16, and 20 were further amended to correct a minor typographical error by inserting "and".

Claim Objection - Informalities

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indicated allowance of claims 14 and 15 if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. See Office Action, p. 2, ¶ 2. Allowable subject matter from claim 14 has been substantially incorporated into base claim 9. Also, Claim 15 was rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim, as suggested by Examiner. Hence, Applicant believes that claims 9 and 15, as well as claims 10-13 which depend therefrom, are allowable as indicated by Examiner.

Appl. No. 10/020,310
Amdt. dated: August 15, 2006
Reply to Office Action of May 17, 2006

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections, Paoli and Riza

The Office Action has rejected claims 9-13, 16, 17, 20, 21 and 25-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,995,267 of Thomas L. Paoli (hereinafter "Paoli"). The Office Action has also rejected claims 9-13, 16, 17, 20, 21 and 25-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,687,036 of Nabeel Agha Riza (hereinafter "Riza"). Applicant submits that recitations of the claims are not taught or suggested by the cited references, and respectfully requests withdrawal of these rejections.

First, neither Paoli nor Riza teaches or suggests a microwave source, as recited in claim 9. In fact, as Examiner correctly notes in the Office Action, a microwave source is allowable subject matter. See Office Action, p. 2, ¶ 2.

Second, Paoli fails to teach or suggest a plurality of end devices distributed throughout a wireless network, as recited in claims 16 and 20. Paoli appears instead to suggest only environments with *collocated* receivers, like printers. These devices use multiplexed information for imaging functions, like transmitting separate color information to a set of *collocated* receivers. See, e.g., Paoli, col. 2, Il. 40-48 (multiplexing a laser allows for "a multiple beam, single ROS xerographic printing system"). This is completely different from using multiplexed information to transmit to *distributed* end devices in a network.

Third, Riza fails to teach time-dividing an optical signal, as recited in claims 9, 16, and 20. Instead, Riza only discloses wave division multiplexing and code multiplexing of optical signals. See, e.g., Riza, Abstract. Wave-dividing or code-dividing a signal is completely different from time dividing a signal.

For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that claims 9, 16 and 20 are allowable. Claims 10-13, 17, 21, and 25-27 all depend from either claim 9, 16, or 20, and are therefore allowable at least by virtue of their dependence from an allowable claim. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

Appl. No. 10/020,310 Amdt. dated: August 15, 2006 Reply to Office Action of May 17, 2006

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,

Reg. No. 52,471

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor San Francisco, California 94111-3834 Tel: 303-571-4000 (Denver)

Fax: 303-571-4321 (Denver)

WJD:sbm

60793663 v1